

From: [Chang, Lisa](#)
To: [Bonifaci, Angela](#)
Cc: [Chang, Lisa](#)
Subject: Some notes from today's call with Larry, 6/26/15
Date: Friday, June 26, 2015 1:44:32 PM

Participants: Larry, Angela, Tiffany, Fran, Lisa

- Section 320 is authority under which we grant these funds. NEP forum is supposed to be collaborative..
- Our counsel has advised us that we do have a regulatory mechanism...we don't want to go there
- We'd like to work together, provide resources, work through MC
- We're hoping we can discuss this together.
- What are you trying to get out of this project, are you open to exploring different approaches?
- Larry
 - What we are proposing isn't different from what we have been doing for past 5 years
 - SCRP – aspirations include amend CWA to deal with non-point issues, regulations associated with riparian buffers.
 - Tribe has been engaged for 25 years in many forums to implement these things. Unsuccessful. TRAR comes from lack of ability to move ball forward.
 - This proposal is framework to educate the public re: need to regulate agriculture.
- Fran: 3, 5, 7 Directors' talk – has to be viewed as part of that 25 years of effort that did not resolve anything. Never any follow-through on the Directors' talks. Maia now working to improve communication between ECY and agriculture but not being able to advance water quality issues.
- Larry – meeting in Cle Elum; Rick was there, 38-39 CDs there; all opposed. Larry stood up and expressed tribal concerns. Had that discussion numerous places and with numerous people.
- Our intent is to inform the public on the need to regulate. How would you suggest we engage the agriculture community? Does EPA want to influence the tone and message that the tribe wants to put out there? I didn't envision that this contract with NWIFC would ultimately land in EPA trying to play a fairly strong role in influencing the message. Even if the tone is changed, would still like to understand with some clarity what you would do to inform the public on the need for regulation on non-point issues.
- Press folks with expertise with messaging to the general public, open to, but not tweaking the message to not alienate the farm community
- EPA and ECY doing the right thing with standards; if your concern is that this may disrupt riparian initiative – that is another discussion; that discussion is identical to the discussion we've had over the last 25 years. If you're concerned about that effort, there's a bigger discussion to be had.
- Don't actually have product, will be another few months before we have project to share.
- Next step – Chairman Cladoosby, Mike Grayum, anyone who needs to be there from EPA
- Fran – I'd like for us to think about what the parameters are for carrying out our task – NWIFC moving funds to tribes. EPA find specific information that provides parameters for

NWIFC to move the money forward. Angela – we should set up a separate conversation with NWIFC about that. EPA is in difficult spot. You are hearing from Larry/Tribe – this money is theirs too. If they can't carry out what is their objective, then that weakens the whole partnership. There are components of agriculture that are not part of the problem.

- Larry – if the intent is to educate the public at large on the impacts of agriculture on water quality. There are a number of farmers doing the right thing, too few farmers despite a multitude of programs. Programmatically not enough. Public willing to spend more for food.
- Fran – where progress has been made, what balance means. Very important part of the conversation. But right now, we need to make a decision on this contract. Timber industry example. Step back and see where we are. Fran would like to have broader discussion – we could be better partners. We are missing opportunities of the energy people are bringing forward.
- Set up discussion for next week between NWIFC and EPA re: parameters NWIFC needs to follow when moving the money.